DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 010 SP 034 429

AUTHOR Simola, Hannu
TITLE From Vocation to Profession or Just Surfing on the Reforms? Teacher Education Discourse in Finnish Committee Reports from 1922 to 1991.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Committees; *Discourse Analysis; *Educational Change; Educational History; Educational Theories; Elementary Education; Foreign Countries; Government Role; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Finland; *Professionalization of Teaching

ABSTRACT

This paper is presented as one stage of a dissertation project titled "Educational Reform as a Social Field: Structuration of Discourse in Teacher Education in Finland." It examines educational transformations and continuities through a discourse analysis of governmental committee reports on teacher education, focusing primarily on the years since the late 1960s and on primary school teacher education. Three discontinuities in Finnish teacher education are identified and discussed: transformation from vocation to ought-to-be profession, transformation from moral conception of the ideal citizen to decontextualized and unquestioned goal rationalization, and transformation in occupational demands on the teacher from behavior to intentions. The relationship of the empirical study with various theoretical perspectives is then examined. These theoretical perspectives include knowledge and power, discourse structuration, professionalization, and social field. (Contains 37 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED357010

From vocation to profession or just surfing on the reforms?

Teacher education discourse in Finnish committee reports from 1922 to 1991

Hannu Simola
Department of Teacher Education
University of Helsinki

Paper presented at the AERA Conference, San Francisco, Ca.
April 20—24, 1992
Part of a symposium entitled
"State regulation, educatonal science,
and professionalization in teaching"

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
H. Simola
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The road to hell is paved with good intentions.
A proverb

When we adopt a belief that scientific knowledge is about the future, we have left science and its relation to the empirical world to move into the realm of ideology and social regulation. The rituals of science become a rhetorical form intended to convince others that what is being done to them is in their own interests.
Thomas S. Popkewitz : A political sociology of educational reform

This paper is one stage in my dissertation project entitled "Educational reform as a social field: structuration of discourse in teacher education in Finland" (see Simola in press). The purpose here is to examine transformations and continuities through a discourse analysis of governmental committee reports on teacher education focusing, however, on the years since the late 1960s and on the primary school teacher education. In those years, a rationalization and systematization process took place concerning the entire educational system through the comprehensive school reform (1972—77), the teacher education reform (1973—79) and the general syllabus and degree reform of higher education (1977—80). In the context of these reforms, primary school teacher education was transferred from seminaries and colleges to universities, and some years later it was raised to the Master's degree level.

The transformation of the discourse on teacher education in the late 1960s and the 1970s is evident and the actors of those committees underscore the change willingly. In this paper, I want to question that self-evidence by tracing what really has changed and what has not —in this case at the level of discourse. Thus the discontinuities and continuities, mutually intertwined, are the focus of this paper.

SP034429

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The theoretical approach of my study is based on concepts such as knowledge and power (e.g. Foucault, Popkewitz), discourse structuration (e.g. Wittrock, Giddens), professionalization (e.g. Collins, Larson, Rinne) and social field (e.g. Bourdieu, Johannesson)[1]. In the final section, I will briefly scrutinize the relation of my empirical study with these theoretical perspectives.

As a text material for this kind of study, the reports by the governmental committees are interesting. A certain centralized tradition, a peculiarity of Finnish culture and history, has its roots in the tight intertwining of the nation- and state-building processes which have left relatively limited space for the "free" civic society. From the 19th century onwards, civic movements and the state have evolved, working towards common aims rather than as rivals or in contradictory positions (see, e.g., Alapuro & Stenius 1987). Social reforms were, and still are, carried out via centralized authority, planned by state employees, and sanctioned through state legislation. Thus the texts of the committees are clearly serious verbal acts of experts who speak as experts. They are "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak"(Foucault 1972, 49).

The committee reports seek to form a compromise and, as such, to appear as the "will of all" (Rousseau). However, the consensus is only seeming because the hegemony has always been in hands of state school officials and representatives of educational science/teacher education (see Table 1 in the appendix). A piece of evidence of this is the fact that those groups have never needed to include a dissenting opinion in the reports[2]. Although the reports do not possess any formal legislative power, their authority is reflected e.g. in the manner how some of them as such have been taken as administrative orders.

The committees on teacher education have covered the timespan examined here well: since 1922 there have been 19 committees and during the most interesting years, from 1950 to 1979, there has been nearly continuosly one governmental committee (or a corresponding working group) convening and making proposals for teacher education reform. The committee reports also have a certain continuity, for traditionally every report relates its work to its predecessors.

* * *

The following conclusion of transformations and continuities in the Finnish committee reports on teacher education is based on the preliminary analysis of the text material[3] and, as such, it is to regard rather as a hypothetical model or a conceptual tool for further study

than as any result of it. It might be necessary to point to that in the following conclusion those reports are seen, to a certain extend, as pure texts without references outside themselves. I have tried to listen what and how they speak as such. In the last section I try to bring them, in a prelimiary and partial manner and via theoretical perspectives, into their social context.

It seems that it is possible to see at least three important discontinuities take place in the discourse on Finnish teacher education since the late 1960s. First of all, there seems to be a transformation in the justification of the primary school teaching occupation from moral devotion to science legitimated education. The change is finally characterized as a transformation *from vocation to ought-to-be profession*. Secondly, it seems to be a transformation of the conception and role of goals which were traditionally seen as ideal pursuits of education and based on essentially the *moral conception of the ideal citizen*. I am going to characterize the new conception of goals as a *decontextualized and unquestioned goal rationalization* where aims, goals and objectives are seen as very essential parts of both planning and practice. As the third discontinuity, a transformation in occupational demands on the teacher seems to have taken place and to have shifted the emphasis *from behavior to intentions*. When this change is seen intertwined with decontextualized goal rationalization and ought-to-be professionalization, one might conclude that there is a deeper transformation in the discourse of teacher education from *model-behavior* to *model-intention*.

From vocation to ought-to-be profession

The transformation in occupational justification from moral devotion to science legitimated education appears to reflect a clear professionalization in the conception of primary school teaching. Ethical issues, such as the teacher as a model citizen and the occupational responsibility of the teacher, do not disappear but the basis of argumentation shifts from *etatist* moral philosophy to educational science. Even though primary school teaching was monopolized for certified teachers already in 19th century, until the 1960s their education is seen as a general preparation for a mission —with a strong ideological emphasis— rather than as training in any specialized knowledge and skills.[4]

The transformation from educated handyman to science legitimated expert is a two-stage process. Until the 1960s, educational studies are seen as just one subject among others compared in the number of hours, for example with handicrafts or music. Between 1968 and 1975, the proposed amount of studies in educational science leaps from 11 credits to 52 credits[5] (see Table 2 in the appendix). In the 1970s, the primary school teacher is seen

as a specialist both in some school subjects and in educational sciences. Sociology, philosophy and history of education are here with although the emphasis is on didactics. Only in the texts of the 1980s, is the expertise based purely on educational science and now —what is remarkable— on a specialized knowledge base characterized as a "teacher education theory"strongly limited to didactics and educational psychology. At the same time, the position of didactics as the core of that scientific basis is being furthered in comparison with other educational sciences, e.g. by establishing a "didactical alternative"[6] in postgraduate studies and through the expansion in different teacher training sectors. Thus it seems that a "specialized, authoritative and counter-intuitive knowledge base" (Labaree 1991a, 22) as one necessity for professionalization has been reached to certain extent.

However, there are at least four continuities which are questioning the professonal turn in primary school teaching. Those continuities are (1) a professionally trivial amount of educational studies in other than primary school teacher training, (2) a professionally low level of practice teaching, (3) a professionally limited work place autonomy of a teacher, and (4) the conception of occupation based on ideals rather than on reality.

The trivial amount of educational studies among other teachers than those for primary school is a clear continuity in the reports. Only in the mid-1970s is there a claim that considerable (40 credits level) educational studies would form the common scientific base for all the teachers, including e.g. the subject teachers. Needless to say, this would be important for making educational science convincing and credible as a solid knowledge base and science legitimation for the teaching profession. Conversely, the later reports are satisfied with the traditional low level (20 credits) of educational studies —the 1989 committee even decreases it.

The second continuity is the undeveloped nature of practice teaching from the professional point of view. While a formal knowledge base is necessary for the science legitimation of a profession on the official level, so is the transmission of so-called "tacit knowledge" on the practical level[7]. The strong continuity of practice teaching in primary school teacher education does not confirm the professional turn. The organization of practice teaching and academic requirements for practice school teachers have not changed or even been challenged to any larger extent in the texts since 1922. The basic function of practice teaching is still grading the "teaching skills" of teacher students rather than being a collegiate transmission of a "concealed", "sacred", "invisible" and "hidden" knowledge formed inside the profession (see, e.g., Jamous & Peloille 1970, Atkinson & Delamont 1985; Rinne & Jauhiainen 1988). While primary school student teachers reach

a level of 55 credits in their educational science studies, the required level for the practice school teachers is still in the 1991 report only 35 credits —the very same level as in the 1922 report.

A certain work place autonomy has been a permanent element in studies or characterizations on professionalism, especially in the Anglo-American tradition[8]. In relation to this, it is curious that only the 1989 report, to some extent, problematizes the strong continuity to see the teacher as a civil servant who just carries out tasks imposed on her/him from somewhere higher in the administrative hierarchy. But, also curiously, the 1989 report does not make any distinction between the individual teacher and the institution where s/he works. According to decentralist ideology, some authority to decide has been moved from the national level to local "authorities and schools". The report naïvely assumes that, in harmony with these rhetorics, the work place autonomy of the individual teacher would necessarily and generally increase. On the contrary, it is possible to claim that the "gazes of power" (StMaurice 1987, 245) comes nearer through rising the authority of local school officials and principals. Thus it is fair to conclude that the 1989 committee, for the first time in the texts being examined, problematizes some aspects of the position of the teacher as a civil servant but, however, does not question it.

The fourth continuity is the basis where the conception of the occupation is formed. At the time of vocational ethos, the conception of primary school teaching is formed on the image of teacher as a model citizen. In the same way, it is now formed on ideals rather than on reality: on goals, intentions and visions of educational reforms. This kind of vagueness or obscurity between reality and the "ought-to-be" world seems to be characteristic of the discourse on Finnish teacher education. There is a curious combination of reality and intentions to ameliorate it. The conception of primary school teaching as a profession seems essentially based on the conception how the school ought to be —i.e. on reform plans and especially on their goals. In sociological literature on professions, there is often characterizations of "semi-", "quasi-" or "would-be" professions when referring to many new occupations willing to be taken as professions (see, e.g., Collins 1990, 16—17). However, I would characterize the primary school teacher occupation as an *ought-to-be profession.*

There is one simple reason for not using terms like semi, quasi and would-be in the case of primary school teachers here. Those terms refer to the tendency of the representatives of certain occupations to pose as professionals; to their pursuit to be accepted as such. The material of this study does not tell much about the pursuits of primary school teachers in this sense —among the 140 members of the committees in question there were

only four classroom teachers in this century and just one since the 1960s! Conversely, there is lot of evidence that others —i.e. administrators, educational scientists and teacher educators— are very willing to conceptualize primary school teachers as professionals. However, this conception seems to be based on an "ought-to-be" rather than a "to-be" reality.

From ideal citizen aims to decontextualized goal rationalization

In the texts until the mid-1960s, the goals were seen rather as *etatist* moral philosophical characterizations and considerations of the ideal citizen grounding the aim and justification of schooling rather than any concrete objectives for planning and everyday work in schools. In the 1970s, the goals crop up in texts as some of the most important tools for an effective and efficient educational reform. In formal terms, the proposed goals are mostly very abstract, general, but at the same time, very ambitious. They are self-evident in a manner which does not allow dissenting opinions. The certain hierarchization and binding nature seems to be typical to them.[9]

Especially the epoch-making report of the 1975 committee is throroughly structured by the goal definition, rationalization and hierarchization. One could even imagine a certain division of labor between "the society" and "the science": the former —represented by the officials of the National Board of General Education and the Ministry of Education— imposes the goals for teacher education deriving them from the more general goals for societal policy, and the later —represented by educational scientists and teacher educators— technically and systematically derives, from those political and value-bound goals, the behavior-level objectives, the contents, the methods and the organization for teacher education. This is, of course, a pure fiction but what seems to be clear is that in planning by goals the administration and educational science find an common subject for intensive cooperation.

Even though in the texts of the 1980s —especially in the 1989 report— the extremist goal centrism is gone, the role of goals is still central: the situation analysis in teacher education is made in relation to the goals imposed by the 1975 committee, the report is structured by different levels of goals and goal definition is central in the formed strategy for change. But what is more important, there seems to be a continuity, through all transformations from the moralist aims (until the 1960s) via the extreme goal centrism (the 1970s and early 1980s) to the recent, more moderate relation to the goals. There seems to be a continuity in the *taking-for-granted* (1) of certain *outside-subjects*

imposing the goals, (2) *the goals* themselves and (3) the sociocultural, historically formed institutional *context* where those goals ought to be brought into the practice.

In the period before the 1960s, the aims are seen as imposed by the Parliament in the form of legislation and by state via its legal administration. The formulation is general and short —their role is more ideological than concrete. Between the 1960s and early 1980s, the goals become more and more precise even in legislation but the proper goal rationalization and hierarchization is made at the committee or administrative level — without any processing at parliamentary level. An eminent educational scientist and teacher educator, Professor Erkki Lahdes, who also has been a member of various committees, notes that

> [t]he goals for comprehensive school are not defined by the parliament nor even by "the legislator". (...) Thus, the experts on society, on branch of knowledge, on child psychology and on education defined the goals for the comprehensive school as members of committees, as persons providing a statement and as spontaneous pressurers. The teachers have been able to effect in those goals to some extent. The opinions of pupils, their parents and political parties were not directly inquired. (Lahdes 1980, 118, 120)

The 1989 report neither problematizes the subject behind the goals nor the goals themselves but sees them rather as self-evident and binding for the institution level actors. The definition of goals is still out of the authority of the institute level to decide. Most of the goals are coming from the "outside-world". Even some of the inside-imposed goals are based primarly on administrative orders —as if seeking confirmation from the real subject. And this, I think, is the most essential element of continuity: the goals are still something from outside, from above which have to be taken-for-granted in self-evident consensus. In spite of decentralistic rhetoric, the authority to decide of the individual practitioners is mainly limited on the methods, objectives and, recently to some extent, on the contents.

The third continuity, taking the school (or institution for teacher education as well) as the context for granted, tends to neglect the analysis of the school as a historically formed, sociocultural institution. In the 1975 report, the macro level is, to some extent, present but in a very abstract and secondary form. Conversely in the 1989 report, there are some references to the micro level but they are not taken seriously —even in a quite fatal case for the strategy for change formed by the committee[10].

It is possible to claim thus that these continuities could have at least two sides or effects. On the one hand, they mean a reification of schooling which, by taking the school institution as a "normal, neutral and natural" context for general human learning and teaching, leads into the unhistorical generalization of learning and teaching in school

environment as a general model for those human activities[11]. It might be of importance that exactly this error makes it easy to impose whatever goals for human learning in the school without questioning if they at all are possible to reach, to any larger extent, in that specific institutional context. On the other hand, taking the school environment for granted strengthens a bold reproduction of prevailing structures and practices while they are not questioned. From this point of view, the decontextualized goals could form a central instrument of power through both rhetoric planning and regulation of the practices where those goals are supposed to be carried out.

From model behavior to model intentions

It is easy, by reading the texts in discussion here, to see that there is a transformation from demands of certain external behavior of teacher to demands of her/his certain internal behavior. The basic distinction goes by formulating that the earlier teacher has to be, has to do or has to behave her/himself in certain way for being accepted as a real teacher, while the later teacher is rather demanded to know, to major, to have an attitude, to struggle for, to internalize. In short, it is possible to say that a certain psychologization of demands on primary school teachers has taken place during the 1970s.

Let us now bind together these three transformations with continuities analysed above. What might be "result" of intertwinement of ought-to-be professionalism, decontextualized goal rationalization and emphasis on intentions in teacher education discourse? The first might lead one to believe on ought-to-be world as a basis for teachers professional self-image, the second calls for engagement with the ambitious —not to say impossible— goals as self-evident, and the third tempts to accept the well-intenting rhetoric as reality just in the way Francis Bacon once warned about *idola fiori* as the power of language over our thoughts: we tend to believe that the concepts have an equivalent in reality, too.

The goals have been imposed at a very abstract and general level but, at the same time, they are very ambitious. The goals, e.g., for teacher training presented by the 1975 report are so demanding that evidently only in very exceptional cases can they be attained. However, the core of requirements might not be in their attainability but in their demands to pursue that direction. This means that a teacher has have a certain intention, has to try, has to have a positive attitude about those goals —in short, has to accept the "realm of truth" expressed by the educational *doxa*. Thus, even though (not to say especially when) the goals are not realistic they can serve as a basis for the control of intention.[12]

We can formulate that this curious combination might from a more basic transformation concerning the circulation of power in a discursive field: it might be characterized as a transformation from controling the model-citizen-behavior to controling the goal acceptance, as a change from model-behavior to the model-intention. In this rupture, there might be something Foucault demanded on the rules of discoursive formations as a principle which is able to explain rather a dispersion than a continuity, rather the curious combination of continuities and discontinuities between elements than any kind of harmony between them.

In sum we can conclude now the following. The teacher still needs —maybe more than ever— the authority to be able to come to the fore of classroom, to get the pupils into the classroom and to keep them there silent enough. This authority is guarateed by the state and legitimited by educational science. The basis for the justification has been characterized here as an ought-to-be professionalization of primary school teaching. But at the same time, reciprocally and as a price for the authority, the teacher should manifest her/his allegiance to the state and, also, to the science. And now, according to my study, in the very core of this allegiance, it could be seen the acceptance of the network of the decontextualized goals which are of vital importance to the legitimacy of modern institutionalized schooling as a core of "the credential society" (Collins 1979). It seems that the teacher is still a model citizen; only the emphasis has shifted from behavior to intention. Finally, it can be asked if it is not a question of a contuinuity rather than a discontinuity: the continuity in control through ideal where the model behavior element is substituted by the model intention element.

* *

As I stated in the introduction, this paper forms one part of my present research project. For that reason, I would like to refer briefly to some perspectives and directions which might be fruitful when going on from this stage in my study. Those are perspectives of power, discourse structuration, and professionalism. Needless to say, these perspectives are not mutually exlusive but complementary.

The emphasis on intentions in the network of decontextualized goals can be seen as a circulation of power in Foucauldian sense. The benevolent and ambitious goals of schooling, as a cornerstone of the "regime of truths", could be seen as basic elements in the professional self-image, no matter if some teachers are sceptical on them or not. The feelings of inadequacy and guilt are possible to interpret as forms of "internalized control" (see, e.g., Popkewitz 1991; Broadfoot & Osborne 1988). Those could also be seen

central from the point of view of reproduction of the structure in the field. While the curriculum is seen formed according to a harmony model (see, e.g., Svingby 1978) and the consensus over the goals of schooling is dominant in the educational field, the only problem appears to be "bringing down" the curriculum, i.e. guilts for failure are to be found in teachers, textbooks, teacher education etc. but never in higher positions in the power hierarchy. The selling, convincing and legitimating functions of educational discourse could also appear in a new light[13]. The sociocultural approach developed e.g. by James V. Wertsch (1991 and 1990; see also Marková & Foppa 1990) —the concept of decontextualized rationalization is borrowed from him— offers an interesting psychological perspective in this issue.

From the perspective of discourse structuration (e.g., Wagner et al 1991; Giddens 1984) of educational science in Finland, it seems important to ask, for further study, what kind of social conditions of discourse structuration there were/are, what are the discourse coalitions and what forms of discourse instutionalization were/are established (Wittrock et al 1991, 75—79). It seems that only during the late 1970s and 1980s, a shift in domination of the "core region" of discursive field of education took place in Finland: the educational science took it over (see Larson 1990, 38). Also the relations of teacher education discourse to other discourses —e.g. Tylerian planning by goals -model, the "Great Goal Discussion" in Finland in the early 1970s, and models of management by objectives and results— are surely essential.

But perhaps the most illuminating perspective in regards to my study, is offered by Randall Collins when he writes:

> Some of the skills of 'professionals', however, are answers to self-created problems; the skill is intrinsic to the professional structure itself, and does not exist without it. (...)
> Hence I would suggest that the model of 'self-created' problems — and the 'professional' knowledge which is a solution to them — may be the most important component for a theory of idealized occupational status groups. (Collins 1990, 20—21)

He gives lawyers, priests and scientists as examples. What about if we apply his idea in cases of Finnish primary school teachers, teacher educators and educational scientists? It immediately becomes clear that it is not the teachers, in first place, who create the problems for which they then present professional solutions. Of course, without teachers those problems would not exist and, thus, they are a part of the structure, indeed. They, however, seem to be a quite passive element in the field, a least on grounds of this study. Besides, they will be faced with many negative effects of this "development": certain deprofessionalization, bureaucratization, hierarchization, expanding expectations etc. (cf. McNeil 1986; Densmore 1987; Murphy 1990).

The web of decontextualized goals, woven in close cooperation by specialists of administration and educational science, could be seen functioning for their own interests more than for that of teachers. It is true that that academization and scientification of teacher training fit the professionalization project[14] of teachers but the real winners could be found —besides the modern welfare state— among the educational scientists and teacher educators (cf. Labaree 1991a and b; Johannesson 1991). Their position in both the educational and academic-scientific field altered dramatically.[15] But what is even more important, the educational scientists —and teacher educators among them— have reached a postion of scientific expertise, guaranteed by the state and recognized by teachers. Taken as authoritative and serious speakers, they are able, through discursive practices "systematically to form the objects of which they speak"(Foucault 1972, 49), and, due to their position as protectors of *doxa* , they are able to strengthen the borders of *the universe of possible discourse* (Bourdieu 1977, 159—170). The capital possessed by them has transformed symbolic, and as such, it forms one key-element of power in (post)modern societies[16].

*

If we find some key concepts in recent sociological jargon, one of those might be the concept of the field or arena. It is a metaphor for a social space where various epistemic and empirical individuals struggle for positions, for capital and for power. Maybe this metaphor is somehow one-sided, especially when speaking about teacher education. Sometimes I have wondered why nobody seems to remember that there are also fields where tomatoes are growing, people are having picnics, lovers are making love and kids are playing games. For that reason, I would like to make a proposition, especially inspired by the wonderful region where we are now but also in relation with my own study. Should we not characterize the social space in teacher education as *a beach* rather than as a field or an arena? And especially as *a beach for surfing*. This beach is a bit far from the harsh reality, from the bright lights and the big cities but, it is no desert either, it is no backwoods. It is a genuine cultural artifact. There is nothing wrong with surfing, quite the contrary: surfing respects the sea, it does not exploit it, it does not use energy resources, it does not pollute. Actually, there is only one disturbing thing about this lovely beach: in order to be allowed to surf there, the surfers are required to have an academic credential in the rhetorics, theory and practice of surfing. Another awkward thing is that only surfing is allowed there: diving, fishing and digging in the sand are strictly forbidden. However, this sounds much worse than it really is. Fortunately, the

rules depend a great deal on who is on duty and, what is even better, outside the office hours there are no rules at all.

Correspondence: Hannu Simola, Faculty of Education, University of Helsinki, Bulevardi 18, SF-00120 Helsinki, FINLAND. E-mail: HSIMOLA@FINUH or hsimola@cc.helsinki.fi, fax: +358-0-191 8073

References

Alapuro, R. & Stenius, H. 1987. Kansanliikkeet loivat kansakunnan. (Civic movements created the nation). In R. Alapuro, I. Liikanen, K. Smeds & H. Stenius (Eds.) Kansa liikkeessä. Vaasa: Kirjayhtymä. Pp. 5-49.

Atkinson, P. & Delamont, S. 1985. Socialisation into Teaching: the research which los its way. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 6 (3), 307-322.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. Outline of a theory of practice. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu. P. 1988. Homo academicus. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press.

Broadfoot, P. & Osborn, M. 1988. What Professional Responsibilty Means to teachers: national contexts and classroom constants. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 9 (3), 165-288.

Collins, R. 1979. The credential society: An historical sociology of education and stratification. New York: Academic Press.

Collins, R. 1990. Changing conceptions in the sociology of professions. In R. Torstendahl & M. Burrage. (eds.) The formation of professions. Pp. 11—23.

Densmore, K. 1987. Profesionalism, Proletarianization and Teacher Work. In Popkewitz (ed.) Critical studies in teacher education. Its folklore, theory and practice. London: The Falmer Press. Pp. 130-160.

Dewey, J. 1922. Human nature and conduct. An introduction to social psychology. London: Georg Allen & Unwin.

Engeström, Y. 1987. Learning by expanding. An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research. Helsinki: Orienta-konsultit oy.

Fichtner, B. 1984. Learning and learning-activity. Two diferent types of learning in school and the historical-societal contexts of the development. In E. Bol et al. (eds.) Education for cognitive develoment. Den Haag: SVO.

Foucault, M. 1972. The archaeology of knowledge. London: Tavistock

Giddens, A. 1984. The constitution of society. Outline of the theory of structuration. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jamous, H. & Peloille, B. 1970. Professions or Self- perpetuating System? In J.A. Jackson (ed.) Professions and Professionalisation. London: Cambridge University Press.

Johannesson, I.A. 1991. The formation of educational reform as social field in Iceland and the social strategies of educationists, 1966—1991. Dissertation at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Kivinen, O. & Rinne, R. 1990. Yliopisto ja valtiousko. (University and the state belief). Tiedepolitiikka 15 (3), 35—42.

Labaree, D.F. 1991a. Power, knowledge, and the rationalization of teaching: A genealogy of the movement to professionalize teachers. Manuscript.

Labaree, D.F. 1991b. Doing good, doing science: The Holmes Group reports and the rhetorics of educational reform. Paper presented at the annual conference of the AERA in Chicago March, 1991.

Lahdes, E. 1980. Peruskoulun uusi opetusoppi. (The new didactics for the comprehensive school). Helsinki: Otava.

Larson M.S. 1977. Rise of professionalism: A sociological analysis. Berkeley, Ca.:University of California Press.

Larson M.S. 1990. In the matter of experts and professionals, or how impossible it is to leave nothing unsaid. In R. Torstendahl & M. Burrage (eds.) The formation of professions. Pp. 24—50.

Marková, I. & Foppa, K. (eds.) 1990. The dynamics of dialogue. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

McNeil, L.M. 1986. Contradictions of Control. School structure and school knowledge. New York and London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Miettinen, R. 1990. Koulun muuttamisen mahdollisuudesta. (On the possibility for change in schooling). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Murphy, R. 1990. Proletarianization of bureaucratization: the fall of the professional? In R. Torstendahl & M. Burrage (eds.) The formation of professions. Pp. 71—96.

Popkewitz, T. 1991. A political sociology of educational reform. Power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education, and research. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rinne, R. & Jauhiainen, A. 1988. Koulutus, professionaalistuminen ja valtio. Julkisen sektorin koulutettujen reproduktioammattikuntien muotoutuminen Suomessa. (Schooling, professionalization and the state: The formation of educated reproduction professions in Finland). University of Turku, Faculty of Education. Research Reports A:128.

Rinne, R. 1986. Opettaja mallikansalaisena. (Teacher of the common people as the model citizen: expansion of teacherhood and the recruitment of the teacherhood in Finland from 1851 to 1986 as expressed in official documents. University of Turku, Faculty of Education. Research Reports A:108.

Simola, H. in press. Educational science, the state and teachers: Forming the corporate regulation of teacher education in Finland (in press). In Thomas S. Popkewitz (ed.) Changing patterns of regulation and power in teacher education: Eight country study of reform practices in teacher education. New York: The State University of New York Press.

Simola, H. 1992. Elämänkatsomustieto tekstinä. (The Ethics: a school subject as a text). Paper presented in the Symposium for Subject-Didactics. University of Helsinki, February 7, 1992.

St Maurice, H. 1987. Clinical supervision and power: Regimes of institutional management. In T.S. Popkewitz (ed.) Critical studies in teacher education. Its folklore, theory and practice. Lewes: The falmer Press. Pp. 242—264.

Svingby, G. 1978. Läroplaner som styrmedel for svensk obligatorisk skola Teoretisk analys och ett empirisk bidrag. (Curriculum as an instrument for steering in Swedish compulsory school). Göteborg Studies in Educational Sciences 26. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. Göteborg.

Torstendahl, R. & Burrage, M. (eds.) 1990. The formation of professions. Knowledge, state and strategy. London: SAGE

Wagner , P., Weiss, C.H., Wittrock, B. & Wollmann, H. (eds.) 1991. Social sciences and modern states. National experiences and theoretical crossroads. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J.V. 1990. The voice of rationality in a sociocultural approach to mind. In L.C. Moll (ed.) Vygotsky and education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 111—126.

Wertsch, J.V. 1991. Voices of the mind. A sociocultural approach to mediated action. London: Harvester Wheatsheaft.

Wittrock, B., Wagner, P. & Wollman, H. 1991. Social sciences and modern state: policy knowledge and political institutions in Western Europe and the United States. In _Wagner , P., Weiss, C.H., Wittrock, B. & Wollmann, H. (eds.). Social sciences and modern states. Pp. 28—85.

Appendix

Teach	ME Others	NBGE	RegA	MunA		EdSci		TEd	TU	Pri
'22 a		2xs				1			1	
'45/47 a		4x			1	2s			2	2
'52/60 a		7xs			1	1				
'63 b		1	1s		1x	2				1
'65 a/b		1x				4s				
'67 a	1	1s	2		3x			1		
'68 b	1x	1				6s				
'69 a	4xs	2			1[17]	1		1		7
'73 c	1x	3s	1		1	2s	3			4
'74/75 a	2	2	1	1	1	2s	1	1	1	8
'78 d	2				3x	3				8
'89 a	1	2x				4s		1		3
'91 d	4s				1x	1				1
total	16	26	5	1	20	22	4	4	4	34

Table 1: The members, chairmen and secretars in the teacher education committees between 1922 and 1991 [18]

Report	'22	'45/47	'65	'67	'68	'69	'74	'75	'78	'89
Total duration of studies credits	60	60	60	90	90	90 120	136	160	160	160
Educational studies credits	11	9	12	12	11	(40)	36	52	53	55
% of total	18	15	20	13	12		26	33	33	34
Basic subject studies credits	48	46	45	18	23	(15)	22	23	38	40
Music	9	10	11	3	4			6	6	
Handicraft	13	15	13	-	-			4	4,5	
Skill subjects in all	36	37	35	7	9			17	19,5	
Practicing credits	19	19	20	20	27	(20)	28	21	20	20
% of total	32	32	33	22	30		21	13	13	13
Specialization studies credits			4	5	30?	(40)		43	30	35

Table 2: The propositions of committees between 1922 and 1991 on the total duration, the educational studies (practice teaching and didactics including the basic subject studies excluded), the oblicatory basic subject studies, the practice teaching and the subject-specialization studies in primary school teacher training based on upper secodary school certification

Notes

[1] see especially Foucault 1972, Popkewitz 1991, Wittrock et al 1991 , Giddens 1984, Collins 1979, Larson 1977, Rinne 1986, Bourdieu 1988, Johannesson 1991

[2] The dissenting opinions are rare in the reports on teacher education, indeed. Only the reports in 1967, 1972, 1974 and 1975 include those.

[3] The comittee reports examined here are the follows:
The Report of the Committee (RC)1922:3. Seminaarikomitean mietintö (The Seminary Committee)
RC 1945:5. Kansakoulunopettajain valmistus- ja jatkokoulutuskomitea I: Laki perusteluineen (The Committee for Preparation and Continuing Education of Primary School Teachers)
RC 1947:1. Kansakoulunopettajain valmistus- ja jatkokoulutuskomitean mietintö. II Asetukset perusteluineen (The Committee for Preparation and Continuing Education of Primary School Teachers)
RC1952:21. Seminaarilainsäädännön uudistamiskomitean mietintö I. Perussäännökset (The Committee for the Reform of the Seminary Legislation)
RC 1960:7. Seminaarilainsäädännön uudistamiskomitean mietintö. Kansakoulunopettajaseminaarien opetussuunnitelmat (The Committee for the Reform of the Seminary Legislation)
KM1963:9. Opettajakorkeakoulukomitean mietintö (The Teachers' College Committee)
RC 1965:B 11. Korkeakouluissa tapahtuvan kansakoulunopettajanvalmistuksen työsuunnitelmatoimikunnan mietintö (The Committee for the Syllabus for Teachers' Colleges)
KM1967: A2. Opettajanvalmistustoimikunnan mietintö (The Teacher Preparation Committee)
KM1968:A6. Opettajanvalmistuksen opetussuunnitelmatomikunnan mietintö (The Committee for the Syllabus for Teacher Preparation)
KM1969:A5. Peruskoulunopettajakomitean mietintö (The Comprehensive School Teacher Committee)
RC 1972:A12. Harjoittelukoulukomitean mietintö (The Practicing School Committee)
RC1973:51. Opettajien jatkokoulutustoimikunnan mietintö (The Comittee on the Continuing Education for Teachers)
RC 1974:101. Vuoden 1973 opettajankoulutuskomitean välimietintö (The 1973 Committee on Teacher Education —the preliminary report)
RC 1975: 75. Vuoden 1973 opettajankoulutustoimikunnan mietintö (The 1973 Committee on Teacher Education)
RC 27/1978. Luokanopettajan koulutusohjelman yleinen rakenne / KATU (The General Structure of the Degree Program for Classteachers / the Report of KATU- Project)
RC 1989: 26. Opettajankoulutuksen kehittämistoimikunnan mietintö (The Committee on the Development of Teacher Education)
RC 1991:46. Opettajankoulutuksen säädöstyöryhmän muistio (The Working-Group on Regulations for Teacher Education)

[4] This might be one explanation for the fact that a formally incompetent primary school teacher received the same salary as a certified one until 1979.

[5] The university studies today in Finland consist of *study weeks* which are basic units of studies and teaching. They are roughly equivalent to *credits* in the U.S. academic degree system. One study week is defined as 40 hours' full-time work by student including all the lectures, seminars, demonstrations and individual work. Thus the full time studies of one year consist of 35—40 study weeks in all. The major level is about 65—80 study weeks (*laudatur* in tratidional academic vocabulary), the minor level about 35—40 study weeks (*cum laude approbatur*) or 15—20 study weeks (*approbatur*)

[6] The problem in PhD studies of teacher students is that they actually have only 55 credits in educational science because the practice teaching is included in their educational studies while the "normal" students do nearly 80 credits in educational science as their major. This is assumed to reflect in their readiness for post graduate studies.

[7] About the two level in knowledge guaranting the prestige and authority of a profession, see, e.g., Rinne & Jauhiainen 1988, 36.

[8] Concerning the two tradition in sociological studies on professionalisation, see, e.g., Torstendahl & Burrage 1990.

[9] Reijo Miettinen (1990, 169—181) scrutinizes in a very interesting way the effects of "planning by goals". He quotes, e.g., John Dewey (1922, 222—223) according whom the emphasis on the goal formulation tends to maintain *staus quo* because the analysis of conditions for the development of activity is not in focus.

[10] Besides the "teacher education theory", the basic resourse for the real change is seen in decentralization ideology. The individual institutions are expected to develope their own profile now when the coordination and regulaton of Ministry and legislation seem to be loosen. The report states, however, in one paragraph that: "Both in raports of the institutes and in the negotiation with rectors, it was seen, as the biggest obstacle for changes, the lack of common time and the fact that for planning, it seems that there is to be found no leadership, no clear views and not much motivation." (RC 1989, 50)
If the basic strategy for change is decentralization, this statement sounds quite fatal and worth of close examinaton. However, the report does not pay any atention on it.

[11] As example of other approach, see, e.g. Fichtner 1984, Engerström 1987, Miettinen 1990. Learning can be scrutinized as a socially developing activity not only in context of schooling. In that approach, learning in school is revealed as a special, in school institution bound form of learning but not as any original, general or only form of that activity.

[12] I think that many students, as many pupils in the school, comprehend this much clearer than their teachers. When interviewing teacher students, one of them said to me: "I think I could write a model answer for all the examinations here... of course the grade would not be very good but passed, anyway... it should contain some beautiful words on goals of school, something about creativity, child centerness and integration... it should contain the right attitude."

[13] It is possible to see at least four different fucntions in this kind of "curricular poetry" (see Simola 1992): (1) the reproduction of the power hierarchy in the educational field, (2) convincing and persuading, above all, the state and the parents to maintain an expensive and long obligatory school system, (3) creating the professonal identity and ethos of teachers, and (4) the production and reproduction of *doxa* and its boarders in discursive field of education.

[14] The Finnish teacher union (OAJ) formed to a powerful actor in educational field at the earliest in the late 1970s while the processe for reform in teacher education was at that time already in a good run.

[15] The transfer of teacher education to the universities meant a clear social and economic rise for Finnish teacher educators. Before the reforms of the '70s, the teacher educators in seminars and teacher's colleges had basically the same qualifications required as teachers in upper secondary schools. The only exception was the University College of Education at Jyväskylä where, besides the professors, some lecturers also had to have PhDs. The state policy was to move virtually all the seminar and college staff to the university faculty. It is resonable to think that this fact tended to deaden the criticism of reform and sceptical expressions toward academic educational science as the basis for teacher training. Actually, the shift from the traditional, missionary-ethos legitimated trainee to the science legitimated expert happend without any remarkable public controversies. One can get some idea of the quantitative increase of teacher educators from the fact that the 1975 report proposed establishment of 500 new posts more while the number of teacher educators in that moment was 375 (RC 1975, 183, 185)

The following table 3 (Kivinen & Rinne, 1990, 39) describes the development of a number of professorships in education (including the associate professors) in Nordic countries:

	1940	'50	'60	'70	'80	'89
Finland	3.5	6	7	23	80	104
Sweden	4	4	6	12	18	29
Norway	2	3	4	12	19	23
Denmark	-	-	2	4	9	11

Table 3: Professorships in education in four Nordic countries

[16] As an intresestig applicatiton of Bourdiean theory where the certain elements of discourse as such can be interpreted as a transformation to symbolic capital, see Johannesson 1991.

[17] Martti Takala oli JKKKn kasvatustieteen professori ja toimi tuolloin Opetusministeriön osastopäälikkönä

[18] Legend for table 1: The character of the task of the commitee: a= teacher education reform in generally, b= curriculum and syllabus reform of teacher education, c= continuing education of teachers.
Leadership: x= chairman, s= secretary (main, or if its not clear, all/both).
Representatives from: ME = Ministry of Education, NBGE = National Board of General Education, RegA = Regional School Administration, MunA = Municipal School Administration, EdSci = Educational Sciences (not included teacher education), TEd = Teacher Education (seminaries, colleges, university college, university departments of teacher education), TU = Teachers' Unions, Pri = principals, Teach = classroom teachers, Others = members of the Parliament, other state officials, representatives of students etc.)